

## VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

Saturday September 23, 1843.

## Self Defence and Non-Resistance—Killing.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

Self defence seems to be the first law of nature. It is natural for all animals to save their own lives, and kill or drive away the enemy. The same natural instinct is powerful in man. In case of an assault by man or beast, the law of nature prompts him to drive away, maim or destroy the life, or power of the assailant. This law seems to be universal, and unchangeable. The God of nature has imprinted it so powerfully in the nature of all animals, that nothing but opposite education, and habits, partially obscure it. It speaks the language of nature, which we ought to listen to with reverence. But the intellectual and moral principle in man, directs him how far he may risk his own life, without taking the life of his opponent. When the alternative occurs, that one or the other must die, then the law of nature, and the intellectual and moral principle, prompts to kill rather than be killed. When the intellectual faculty can see that by some means less cruel life can be saved, the moral power will urge the saving of the life. If there is no other way but kill or be killed, it is lawful to kill in self defence, and Non-Resistance would be a sort of suicide or self murder in such cases.

Again, May life be lawfully taken when no assaulting or threatening opponent appears? Yes.—Suppose a boat, full loaded with men, and a man swimming get hold of the boat and like to sink it, would it not be better to shove him off to the mercy of the waves, and let him be drowned, than to let him get in and cause the whole to be drowned? Suppose a physician to find a woman in travail of a living child, and every symptom shows that both must die, (the mother first,) or the life of one be taken to save the other—taking the life of the child and saving the life of the mother is obviously the duty of the physician. Of two inevitable evils choose the least. "It is better that one member perish than the whole body." It is better that an eye, an arm, or a leg, be cut off, than "that the whole body perish." Such cases might be mentioned in abundance, but these may suffice to show when life may lawfully be taken. Not taking life in such cases would be tacitly permitting the death of the whole body and next to deliberate and malicious murder.

Remark.—There is two sorts of war or killing. Namely, the killing characters by words, and killing persons by actions. Almost all zealous reformers use harsh and provoking words, and in so doing, invite retaliation; and are often the cause of their own persecution.—Hard thoughts produce hard words, and hard words produce hard blows, and blood shedding. A Non-Resistant can not consistently resist an opponent by words. The Friend Quakers submit peaceably to have their property taken, to pay for war and murder, rather than resist by provoking words, and epithets. The tone of their words, and the peaceable-like actions, shows generally a kindness, that disarms the temper of their assailants, and persecutors.—Much, very much, might be gained to stop law-suits, harsh and insulting language, and shedding of blood, by using conciliatory, and kind words, and actions. Kindness to the brute animals has much more effect to soothe and moralize their temper, than most people imagine. So it is with men.

BARTHOLOMEW SOMMER.

How long it has been said that "self-defence is the first law of nature," I know not, and am not curious to inquire. It is time at least that those who use it know better than I think some of them do, what they mean by it. My own opinion is, that, on examination, it will be found, like many other dogmas, to be a different thing under investigation from what it appears to be, while let alone unexamined. I recollect that while I was advocating Non-Resistance in a Baptist Association, some years since, an old man full of the spirit of religion and war, which have always gone so well together, arose and said,—brother Murray, you need not think to see your doctrine prevail while we "revolutionaries" remain. And he or some other one added—"self-defence is the first law of nature." At this, an insane man present replied—"self denial is the first law of grace." The words nature, and grace, have been abundantly used by religionists who claim to be the teachers of such things as they say others are under obligation to learn and to receive. One of these words is about as well defined and understood as the other, probably. Those who use them most have not probably taken the most thought for themselves, to know whether or not in their own minds any definite meaning is attached to them, or either of them.

My correspondent is a man whose independence of thought I would not question. But is he sure that he has used the phrase—"self-defence is the first law of nature"—for himself? Or has he adopted it without examination what has so generally been taken as self-evident, without inquiry? Let us see. Is the sentiment

adopted designed to be applicable to the strong, or to the weak, or to equals? If to the strong in distinction from the weak, it is not necessary. The strong do not need to defend themselves against the weak. If they treat them kindly they will not be attacked by them. And they have no right to provide a justification for themselves in their own wrong doing, in the case they treat the weak unkindly.

But is it intended for the weak, in distinction from the strong? If so, it fails, for want of power on the part of the attacked. An attempt at defense is only suicidal, on the part of the weak. Conciliation is for better, and will be found far more effectual. And besides, when we come to examine the facts in the case, we shall find them overthrowing the dogma, so long and so widely adopted as a self-evident truth. I say the facts in the case, as they exist in connection with the weak, who have need of defense, show the declaration, that self-defence is the first law of nature, to be a falsehood. For the weak, as a general thing, do not make defense, in the animal kingdom, but flee unresistingly. How is it among the domestic animals, under our notice? Do those who have found and felt their weakness, withstand their superiors and make defense? No. The cow which is mistress of the yard robs the others of the best of the hay, and they do not resist her. The rule will hold good, in general, throughout the brute creation.

But is it rather intended for equals? And what is the result, but extermination? But it may be said, after all, that the equality or inequality may not be known until there is trial. Well, if the trial be to know who shall rule and who be ruled, or who shall rob and who be robbed, it is an effort unworthy of rational beings. If there be an attack for any other purpose, and the one attacked goes to work madly for no other purpose but for defense, the right to begin the strife and war, is the right to carry it on, and carry it through, to the destruction of the one party or the other, and, if they be equals, to the destruction of both.

Now taking the whole matter of attack and defense together, as it goes on thro'out the animal kingdom, from man downward, or from the lower order of brutes upward, I see not why attack is not as natural as defense. How is it among the cattle? Do those which attack act less naturally than those which defend? Who will say that they do? If none will, then why should we not say that it is the first law of nature to attack, as well as to say it is the first law of nature to defend?

Let us now use language that can be better defined and understood.—Instead then of saying, or undertaking to say, what is natural or what is unnatural, let us talk of things coming from man's baser nature and things coming from his better nature—in other words, his lower nature and his higher nature—or in other words still, man as an animal being and man as an intellectual being. It is my own view that the whole matter of violence, offensive and defensive is brutish—in other words, it comes from that part of our nature in alliance with the brutes. It does not come from man as an intellectual being. It may have been worthy of men in the infancy and childhood of the race. It is better worthy of children now than men. The time has come for it to be known that man is susceptible of something better, to which he should be directed, attracted, and encouraged on, as a progressive being. There is a higher and better philosophy for man to attain to than to butcher his brother.

My correspondent has undertaken to lay down rules, or to establish permissions for killing. Why would it not be better to leave that matter to regulate itself, according to circumstances when they come, and go about inducing men to overcome their killing propensities which yet remain of their ignorance and perverseness, to a lamentable extent? Do all we can for man's regeneration, and there will still remain too much killing under unjustifiable circumstances, for a long time yet to come. It is not for me, in my view of the matter, to point out beforehand circumstances under which human beings may be killed. I do not say that all who have killed human beings have done intentional wrong. By no means. If I were to undertake to lift the land of condemnation from crushing what is past in human conduct, in the matter of man-killing, I might be found startling even those who yet indulge the war spirit. My mantle of charity is constantly enlarging here. I find myself constrained to pity

and deplore where I formerly condemned, and where others still condemn. Even a bloody-minded priesthood, through whose instrumentality, very much, gibbets and prisons are kept in operation, disposing of victims prepared by their own hands, I look upon as an unfortunate class of beings, perhaps as much to be pitied as their victims. Fear rules over the priesthood with the same tyrannous hand that they stretch out over their victims. Driven about in blindness and ignorance by this monster, "they know not what they do." It is so with all those who use violence towards their fellow beings. Themselves afraid of violence from beneath, or violence from above, or violence from around, they go forth in the exercise of violence at a venture. 'Tis pitiable.—'Tis truly deplorable. The remedy is chiefly in the hands of those who see the disease. Knowing what they are about, let them exercise all possible patience and faithfulness.

It amuses me to find our friends who justify physical violence, to the extent of taking life, so often reading homilies to Non-Resistants, on the subject of kindness and conciliation. This is not said by way of retort upon my correspondent. I take no exceptions to what he has written on this point. It is well. And it is more or less needed too. Non-Resistants have not all of them sufficiently overcome their baser propensities and brought them into harmony with their better faculties. They only claim the right to point out the light as they see it, resolving to do what in them lies to practice consistently with their preaching. I will only add here, that if kindness and conciliation be the thing to be practiced by Non-Resistants, it is the thing to be practiced by all.

For the Vermont Telegraph.  
CHRISTIANITY AND INFIDELITY.  
Randolph, Sept. 3d, 1843.

Brother Murray:—As I am a free thinker, and believe in untrammelled freedom of speech, to speak for God or enslaved man, I take the liberty to send you a few of my imperfect thoughts, which, if you think proper, you may publish. I believe that pure Christianity is of Divine authority and origin, and will invariably flourish in its greatest simplicity and purity, when least supported by legal authority. That it is in its origin and essence, totally foreign from, and independent of, all political rule or legislation, and for political rulers to interfere, and undertake to regulate, or enforce it, is assuming the attributes of Deity, and is a gross offence to God, and an insult to man. Yet they do undertake to unite Church with State, and to regulate what they call Religion. These church and state apologists at the present day would exercise the worst of tyranny—that over the mind. Among this class—and the foremost—may be reckoned that set of men called Clergymen—a selfish, hypocritical, sectarian clergy. "The clergy of every established church have always been, for very obvious reasons, opposed to reformation. They very well know that the diffusion of light and knowledge would spoil their trade, and expose their abominations to the execrations of their deluded followers. It is from this genuine source and fountain head of infidelity, that the muddy streams of pestiferous calumny have ever flowed, and still continue to flow.—The friends of Liberty, and pure Christianity, who are bold enough to preach up the Doctrine of universal reform, however exalted in piety, are, even in these latter days, denounced as infidels, anarchists, disorganizers, fanatics, enthusiasts, ultraists, &c. And none are orthodox who dissent, (however conscientiously,) from the established religious and political opinions." The above extract, from the Herald of Gospel Liberty, written thirty years ago, is as true now as it was then, and speaks a volume of truth with regard to the fountain head of infidelity being the established Clergy.

The false alarm of Infidelity, now circulating through this land, is from this source of corruption and darkness, from masked infidels, under the pretence of defending Christianity! but in reality to defend priestcraft and despotism. The integrity of the robber is in being the first to cry, stop thief! stop thief. So it is with the clergy. They cry, infidelity, infidelity, when they are the greatest infidels, masked under the pretence of defending religion. An open, avowed infidel is entirely harmless, in comparison with one of them. I know not the history that contains blacker crimes of every description than have been committed by this blood-thirsty Priesthood. Now, these things being so, are they not wolves in the midst of sheep—not sparing the flock

—professing to be God's ministers, but in works denying him, guards dressed in black, standing in the steeple house or synagogue, to prevent Christ's servants from preaching the Gospel of peace and universal liberty to the people? While they cry, peace, they bite with the teeth, yes bite like a serpent and sting like an adder, and the way of peace they know not, nor appear to care for, if they can but hoodwink the people and accomplish their selfish designs, and maintain their sectarian creeds.

Now while we view, the course pursued by this state-religion-clergy of the day in which we live, and contrast it with Christ's injunctions to his disciples, we must consider them as wise as doves, and as harmless as serpents. But the woe of God is upon them, and they cannot prosper. See Mathew 23d, where Jesus calls them, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites—fools, and blind guides—loving the chief seats in the Synagogue and to be called men Rabbi—and devour widows houses—and for a pretence make long prayers, &c., of whom he says, Serpents, generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Now I may be asked if I mean to apply this to Christ's ministers? I say, nay, not one word of it. It applies to the pretended ministers of Christ, who teach for hire, and divine for money—that shut up the kingdom of heaven against men—that make clean the outside of the cup and platter—and that kill and crucify, and persecute from city to city, the prophets, and wise men which Christ has sent to preach the Gospel to every creature. "Then are ye my disciples indeed, if ye do whatsoever I command you." "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and to live with you always," &c. The examples and teaching of Christ are all right, and calculated to inspire the christian with confidence and zeal to love and serve God, and to love his neighbor as himself; in short, to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God. But the commands and doctrines of men are a stumbling block which impedes the christian in his course heavenward.

For my own part, I have concluded to withdraw from all the doctrines and commandments of men, and to "touch not; taste not; and handle not; which all are to perish with the using." "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." I am willing to leave the shadow for the substance, any time. I believe it is very inconsistent with the profession of a christian, to have any thing to do with politics. We pray, "thy kingdom come," and Jesus said, "my kingdom is not of this world." Now can a christian use his influence to sustain the violent kingdoms of this world and be guiltless, or act consistently? I think he cannot. If I think wrong, I ask the favor of being righted; for I will exchange error for truth, and think I am the gainer. But I stop for the present by saying,—Be fearless and faithful, and stand at your post, Refuse nothing right, and count well the cost.

JOHN T. PEARSON.

## MISCELLANY.

## Poor but Respectable.

The Ohio State Journal, in noticing the sudden death of a citizen of Franklin county, says he was "poor but respectable." We cannot, in our charity, charge the editor with meaning to say that respectability is an uncommon attendant of poverty, but this expression renders him liable to be so understood. The obnoxious "but" is too often used in this connection. "Poor but respectable"—as if, forsooth, it was rare to find virtue linked with poverty! and that respectability, as a matter of course, is conferred by wealth! Such is the import of this common and detestable expression—and while we are not disposed to impute to those who use it, any unworthy aristocratic predilections, we could wish that this "poor but respectable" phrase might be speedily consigned to the receptacle of things obsolete. We absolutely loathe it,—it "stinks in our nostrils." It is not only as absurd as it is anti-republican, and of pernicious tendency in its influence on the minds of the young, but it implies an abominable falsehood. Wealth is merely a fortuitous circumstance, and confers no merit of itself;—respectability may be joined with it, but does not follow from it, and cannot, like wealth, be the foundation of an aristocracy, since it is free to all, and attainable by all in common;—and we hazard nothing in asserting, that, in all time past, virtue—the element of all true respectability—has been found as often, at least, in the lowly cottage of the poor as in the gorgeous mansion of the rich,—and it is a blessed consolation to the children of adversity; wherever within earth's borders they may dwell, that, however much they may be excluded from a participation in the benefits enjoyed by monopolies of wealth and

monopolies of power, they cannot be excluded—it is not in the power of man to exclude them—from the enjoyment of that purest and chiefest of all earthly happiness—"the soul's calm sunshine and heartfelt joy"—which follows from a conscience void of offence toward God and man:—and this alone, is the element of true respectability.—N. E. Farmer.

From the Philadelphia Citizen Soldier.  
WHIPPING IN THE NAVY.

We perceive by a recent article in the papers, which has been widely published and then contradicted, that a certain Lieut. McLaughlin was about to be tried by a Court Martial on a charge of murder.—Corporal Pierpont, of the marines, cousin of the Rev. John Pierpont, of Boston, was whipped to death sometime since, and Lieut. Mc L. is charged with sanctioning the act. We did not write it down in a mistake, reader—he was whipped to death—an American citizen, born of the land of Washington, born of the land of Hancock, was strung up by the thumbs, and while a boy of a midshipman stood by, giving the word of command, he was lashed, lacerated, and whipped—not like a dog—no, no! for never was a dog treated thus—but he was whipped like an American citizen in the service of his country.

He was whipped to death. What a beautiful book it would make, to bind the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States together, and add by way of a commentary, the "brave and righteous account, how three men, citizens of the United States, were hanged, by one brave Commander Mackenzie, and how he hurried for God," &c., &c. And then you might finish the book with an appendix—"How Corporal Pierpont was whipped to death." As for the engravings, you might have a neat etching by "Phiz," representing a full grown man tied up by his thumbs, with the American flag waving overhead—while Alex. Siddell McKenzie is hurrying for God, in the distance.

Corporal Pierpont was whipped to death, in the American service. Just think of that, farmers of the country, when you boast of your freedom and liberty, on 4th of July occasions—and when the star spangled banner waves over your heads, think that you behold pictured on its folds, three men hanging at the yard arm, while a fourth is being scored by the lash. And when your jubilation swells highest, and "Hail Columbia" and the "Health of the President" are given, then fancy this jovial chorus floating on the air:

"They hang at the yard arm swinging so gay,  
Their feet in the air, their faces to heaven  
Now boys," quoth the captain, "kneel ye down  
and pray!"  
And then three jolly cheers for God were given  
Hurrah, hurrah for God."

CAMPFIRE OIL.—The Boston Courier says:—"We learn from a gentleman who has curiosity enough to take note of such occurrences, that fourteen deaths have been caused by the accidental explosion of the camphine oil."

According to this statement, people might as well burn gunpowder candles—or what say you to bunches of Chinese crackers, hung over the tea-table? Nearly all the improvements of the age, from banks down to Croton water pipes, have this objectionable tendency to blow up. Our civilization is decidedly of the Vulcanian order, and the march of mind is too often at the expense of its own tabernacle, the body. The general order ought to be, "stand from under!" whenever a man announces a great invention.—*Charleston Mercury.*

EXPENSES OF ROYALTY.—Mr. Weed, in one of his late popular letters from England, gives the following item of the Parliamentary appropriation in 1843, being the Queen's civil list:—The Queen's private purse, £100,000; royal household salaries, 131,260l.; tradesmen's bills, 172,500l.; royal bounty alms, 13,000l.; unappropriated, 8,000l.; Duke of Cumberland (who is also King of Hanover,) 21,000l.; Duke of Cambridge, 27,000l.; Duchess of Gloucester, 16,000l.; Queen Adelaide, 100,000l.; Duchess of Kent, 30,000l.; Prince Albert, 30,000l.; King Leopold, 50,000l.; making in all over £700,000, or three million five hundred thousand dollars annually, for the support of the royal family.—*Asylum Journal.*

THE FRUITS OF THE SYSTEM.—Mrs. Chapman, residing near Athens, Alabama, was recently, in the absence of her husband, decoyed into the woods by three of her slaves, and murdered. On the return of Mr. Chapman, an attempt was made to murder him, also, as had been pre-arranged by the slaves, but the plot failed, and the master escaped. The slaves were arrested, the murderer escaping, and whirling his axe at his master as he retreated to the woods. The slave is 45 years old from Virginia, and avers that he murdered his master and mistress in that state.—Such tragedies are not of unfrequent occurrence in the slave states, and may naturally be looked for as the legitimate fruits of a system of intolerable oppression. This danger, however, may be obviated by emancipation. It is the slave and not the freed man, that strikes vengeance at the life of the planter. How long before this truth will be regarded by the supporters of slavery at the south?—*Ch. Freeman.*

All are not saints who go to church.

## AGRICULTURAL.

Wood-Ashes, Coal-Ashes, Soot, Peat-Ashes. Wood-ashes contain, in a greater or less degree, all the more essential elements, or substances which form the food of plants,

except ammonia; or rather all those which are not abundantly supplied by the atmosphere. The most abundant of these are potash and earthy phosphates. The quantity of these, however, is very variable in the ashes of different plants. Those produced by beech wood contain about one fifth part of phosphates, while those of the oak yield scarcely any phosphates.—The powerful effect of wood-ashes in promoting the growth of clover of every kind, is well known. In Germany, no other manure is used for grass lands, and by these they are kept in the highest state of productiveness. Considering how indispensable they are to keep up the fertility of the soil, they should be taken as much care of as money, for they are certainly most valuable.

The following table contains a statement of the quantity of potash contained in some of the common trees and plants:—

10,000 parts of Oak,	15
" Elm,	39
" Beech,	12
" Vine,	55
" Poplar,	7
" Thistle,	55
" Fern,	62
" Cow-thistle,	196
" Wormwood,	730
" Vetches,	375
" Beans,	200

The ashes produced from the leaves of trees contain much more potash than those of the twigs and branches, and these of the latter more than those of the trunk of the tree; while the ashes of the two latter contain the most phosphate and carbonate of lime. The quantity of potash in the leaves varies very much with the season of the year, being greatest in the spring and least in the autumn.

In some parts of England it is the practice to burn the stubble for the sake of the benefit afforded to the succeeding crop by the ashes; and it is a very common practice upon the continent. Considering the value of straw for litter, this must be a practice of very doubtful wisdom; and where the stubble is not cut for litter, it must, when plowed down, ultimately afford to the land all that the ashes contain, and something more.

Coal Ashes are generally available to farmers, and there are few situations in which they are not beneficial, especially to clover and grass crops; and a consideration of the substances they contain will readily account for the effect they produce. Besides the earthy and imperfectly burnt coal matter of which they principally consist, they also contain sulphate of lime, with some potash and soda, all of which are known, when applied separately, to produce a good effect on clover crops, and to favor the production of white clover particularly. They are, in fact, an important part of the food of all grasses.

Peat is often within the farmer's reach, and whenever it is, may be turned to a very good account either to burn for the ashes, to apply directly to soils deficient in vegetable matter, or for the preservation and augmentation of the compost heap. The ashes of peat differ very much in value, as they are poor or rich in saline matter, and in some situations they are the only manure used for the turnip crop, at the rate of from thirty to fifty bushels per acre.

Soot must have a powerful effect as a manure, from the large quantity of ammonia it contains. It is extensively used as a top-dressing, spread by hand, at the rate, on seeds and pasture, of twenty to thirty, and on wheat, barley and turnips from forty to forty five bushels per acre. It is, however, more generally employed on wheat, and is considered one of the most powerful top-dressings for that crop with which we are acquainted; and experiments show its power to be materially increased by an admixture of one fourth of common salt; more particularly when laid upon pasture land, the grass of which soon after assumes a growth of much increased luxuriance. Though it has almost always been used as a top-dressing, it is probable that it would have a greater effect if used as a compost with other substances by means of the drill; and has in that manner been successfully employed in the cultivation of potatoes, by an eminent farmer in Gloucestershire. We perceive, also, that, in a recent comparative experiment on different manures for the growth of carrots, 54 bushels of soot and 6 of salt, produced larger crops of both the Allington and White Belgian species, than 24 tons of stable manure and 24 bushels of bones.—*Fulkner's Farmer's Journal.*

## WALTONS'

Vermont Register and Farmer's Almanac  
FOR 1844.

THE publishers will have the Vermont Register for 1844 more full and complete than any which has ever before been published, and it will be issued on or near the first of December, or as soon as a FULL and correct Register can be issued.

The edition will be limited, and orders must be made soon to secure a supply. Booksellers, paper makers, merchants, &c. should address their orders immediately to E. P. WALTON and SONS, Montpelier, Vt.

Editors in Vermont will be entitled to one dozen Registers by publishing this advertisement three weeks.

Sept. 10, 1843.

## Commissioner's Notice.

WE the subscribers, being appointed by the Hon. Probate Court for the district of Rutland, commissioners to receive, examine and adjust all claims and demands of all persons against the estate of Daniel Barnes late of Brandon in said district, deceased, represented insolvent, and also all claims and demands exhibited in office thereto; and six months from the 21st day of August 1843 being allowed by said court for that purpose, we do therefore hereby give NOTICE that we will attend to the business of our said appointment at the dwelling house of the Widow on the second Wednesday of November and February next, from ten o'clock until five o'clock, P. M., on each of said days.

Milo K. Davis, Com'rs.  
F. SCOTFIELD.

Dated Brandon, Aug. 25th, 1843.